



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,848	02/24/2004	Peter Gernold	13906-184001 / 2003P00962	9474
32864	7590	04/29/2010	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ZELASKIEWICZ, CHRYSTINA E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/784,848	Applicant(s) GERNOLD, PETER	
	Examiner CHRYSTINA ZELASKIEWICZ	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-15, 19 and 25-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-15, 19, 25-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on January 25, 2010, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The grounds of rejection are set forth below.
2. To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:
 - a. file a reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.113; or,
 - b. initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 C.F.R. § 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.
3. This action is in reply to the Appeal Brief filed on January 25, 2010.
4. Claims 1-6, 10-15, 19, and 25-31 are currently pending and have been examined.

Double Patenting

5. The provisional double patenting rejection is maintained from the previous office action. Please see below.
6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

7. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

8. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7, and 15 of copending Application No. 10784196. Although the conflicting claims are not identical,

they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter of the instant application would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of the disclosure of application 10784196. Claims 1, 7, and 15 of application 10784196 are directed to accessing the type of data to be distributed and the distribution criterion, and generating data subscriptions based upon the type of data and the distribution criteria (see Application No. 10784196 claims 1, 7, and 15). Claims 1, 10, and 19 of the instant application are directed to receiving information from a user for use in generating data subscriptions with steps for the following: receiving data and a distribution criterion; storing distribution criteria and the type of data to be distributed; and for generating data subscriptions based on the type of data to be distributed. The instant application would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of claims 1, 7, and 15 of application 10784196 because if the data and distribution criterion can be accessed, then the person of ordinary skill would have received and stored this information in order to generate the data distribution.

10. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 1, 10, and 19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the double patenting rejection, set forth in this Office action.

12. Claims 2-6, 11-15, and 20-26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the double patenting rejection, set forth in this Office action, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Interpretation

13. Examiner finds that because the examined claims recite neither “step for” nor “means for”, the examined claims fail Prong (A) as set forth in MPEP § 2181 I. Because all examined claims fail Prong (A), Examiner concludes that all examined claims do not invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph. See also *Ex parte Miyazaki*, 89 USPQ2d 1207, 1215-16 (B.P.A.I. 2008) (precedential).

14. Should Applicant amend the claims to recite “means for”, Applicant is respectfully reminded that the specification must have proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1), MPEP § 608.01(o), and MPEP § 2181 IV.

15. After careful review of the original specification and unless expressly noted otherwise by Examiner, Examiner concludes that Applicant is not his own lexicographer. See MPEP § 2111.01 IV.

16. Examiner hereby adopts the following definitions under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard. In accordance with *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1056, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1029 (Fed. Cir. 1997), Examiner points to these other sources to support his interpretation of the claims. Additionally, these definitions are only a guide to claim terminology since claim terms must be interpreted in context of the surrounding claim language. Finally, the following list is not intended to be exhaustive in any way:

- c. **Microprocessor:** "[a] central processing unit (CPU) on a single chip."
Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, Microsoft Press, Redmond, WA, 1997.

17. Note that claims 10 and 19 recite "processor." Because Applicant's specification does not lexicographically define "processor", Examiner uses the broadest reasonable interpretation to define "processor" as hardware. Thus, Examiner interprets claims 10-15, 19, and 25-31 as requiring a hardware component; therefore, claims 10-15, 19, and 25-31 are not directed to software alone.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment filed on March 13, 2009 necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

19. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

20. Because this application is now final, Applicant is reminded of the USPTO's after

final practice as discussed in MPEP §714.12 and §714.13 and that entry of amendments after final is *not* a matter of right. “The refusal of an examiner to enter an amendment after final rejection of claims is a matter of discretion.” *In re Berger*, 279 F.3d 975, 984, 61 USPQ2d 1523, 1529 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citations omitted). Furthermore, suggestions or examples of claim language provided by Examiner are just that—suggestions or examples—and do not constitute a formal requirement mandated by Examiner. Unless stated otherwise by an express indication that a claim is “allowed,” exemplary claim language provided by Examiner to overcome a particular rejection or to change claim interpretation has *not been addressed* with respect to other aspects of patentability (e.g. §101 patentable subject matter, §112, 1st paragraph written description and enablement, §112, 2nd paragraph indefiniteness, and §102 and §103, prior art). Therefore, any claim amendment submitted under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 that incorporates an Examiner suggestion or example or simply changes claim interpretation will nevertheless require further consideration and/or search and a patentability determination as noted above.

21. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Chrystina Zelaskiewicz whose telephone number is 571.270.3940. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached at 571.272.6779.

Art Unit: 3621

22. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

/Chrystina Zelaskiewicz/
Examiner, Art Unit 3621
April 23, 2010

/ANDREW J. FISCHER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621